



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,350	07/09/2001	Rajeev Chawla	24631.710	5351

7590 12/09/2004

BRAIN R COLEMAN
PERKINS COLE LLP
P O BOX 2168
MENLO PARK, CA 95026

EXAMINER

AKPATI, ODAICHE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/901,350

Applicant(s)

CHAWLA ET AL.

Examiner

Tracey Akpati

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-36 and 51-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-36 and 51-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to a phone conversation made 11/11/04 and 11/22/04. The attorney, Carina M. Tan (45,769) contacted the examiner on the previous date disclosing that an address update had not been made despite previous address updates that were previously mailed in, namely a Power of Attorney dated 5/26/04. The date of this action has hereby been reset accordingly.

2. Claims 24-36 and 51-58 are pending. Claim 24 has been amended.

3. The 112 rejection has been withdrawn due to clarification by the attorney.

4. The arguments by the attorney have been considered. The arguments are over the amended limitation of Claim 24. The limitation of the first secure session being used to encrypt and transmit the requested content from the SRP to the web browser and the limitation of the third secure session being used to encrypt data stored in the SRP was just disclosed by the attorney in the current amendment. Hence, the amended Claim 24 makes the arguments by the attorney moot. Hence the newly amended claim(s) are rejected as shown below.

4. With respect to Claim 25 and 51, its rejection has been modified to better illuminate the scope of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 24, 26, 28, 29, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's (N.P.S.A) Guide.

With respect to Claim 24, the limitation “coupling at least one SRP among at least one web browser and at least one web server wherein the at least one SRP receives from the at least one web browser requests for establishing a first secure session” is met in Chapter 7, in Fig. 7.4.

Further limitation of “establishing the first secure session using a first secure session protocol between the at least one SRP and the at least on web browser, wherein the web browser sends an encrypted request for content to the at least one SRP” is met by Chapter 7 on Figure 7.4 and Chapter 7, page 3, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs. The paragraphs describe the figure 7.4 and disclose the referenced limitation.

Further limitation of “decrypting the encrypted request for content from the at least one web browser at the at least one SRP using the first secure session protocol, wherein the at least one SRP using the first secure session protocol, wherein the at least one SRP determines that the at least one SRP does not possess the requested content” is met by Chapter 9 in the “How Caching Works” section and Fig. 9.1. This section and figure discloses how a request from a client to a remote server is detoured to the proxy server that determines whether the content is available there.

Further limitation of “establishing a second secure session using a second secure session protocol between the at least one SRP and the at least one web server, wherein the second secure session is maintained” is met by Chapter 7 on Figure 7.4. This figure shows that a second secure session is established between the proxy server and the web server.

Further limitation of “encrypting the request for content from the at least one web browser using the second secure session” is met by Chapter 7 on Fig. 7.4 and the paragraph above this figure.

Further limitation of “sending the encrypted request for content to the at least one web server using the second secure session” is met by Chapter 7 on Fig. 7.4.

Further limitation of “receiving the content from the at least one web server at the at least one SRP using the second secure session” is met by Chapter 7 on Fig. 7.4.

Further limitation of “decrypting the content using the second secure session protocol” is inherently met by Chapter 7 on Fig. 7.4 and the paragraph above the figure because the SRP cannot read the data received unless it is decrypted.

Further limitation of “encrypting said content using the first secure session protocol for sending, using the first session, to the at least one web browser in response to the encrypted request for content” is met by Chapter 7 on Fig. 7.4. This first encrypted, secure session is depicted in the cited figure between the client and the proxy, and is used to transmit the requested content from the SRP (proxy) to the client (web browser). This is the same first secure session that the client initially used to request content from the SRP.

Further limitation of “encrypting the requested content using a third secure session protocol for storing the encrypted requested content locally in a memory at the at least one SRP”

is met by Chapter 14, first and second pages. The reference discloses encryption in a proxy server. The proxy server represents the SRP. The second page lists the various types of encryption protocols possible. Hence a third secure session for encrypting the requested content and storing that content locally in a proxy server (SRP) is inherent.

The final limitation of “retrieving the content from the memory at the at least one SRP upon subsequent requests for the content” is met by Chapter 9 in the “How Caching Works” section.

With respect to Claim 26, the limitations “wherein storing includes using non-volatile media” is met by the Netscape Proxy Administrator’s Guide on Chapter 9, first and fourth paragraph. The cache is described under the “Understanding the Cache Structure” of Chapter 9, first paragraph as consisting of partitions, which is a storage area located on a disk. These disk partitions are non-volatile storage media and hence will retain information when the power is removed.

With respect to Claim 28, the limitation “wherein coupling includes collocating the web server and the SRP” is met on Chapter 7 on page 4, “Proxying for Load Balancing” section, first three paragraphs.

With respect to Claim 29, the limitation “wherein content includes an HTTP page” is met by Chapter 9, page 1, third paragraph.

With respect to Claim 36, the limitation “before storing the HTTP page, encrypting the HTTP page” is met by on Chapter 7, figure 7.4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide in view of Bellwood (WO 01/03398 A2).

With respect to Claim 25, all the limitation is met by Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's(N.P.S.A.) Guide except the limitation disclosed below.

The limitation “wherein the third secure session protocol is known only to the at least one SRP” is met by Bellwood on page 3, lines 31-36. The third secure session is obvious from the disclosure of the first session master secret because this secret can be used by the proxy to cache/encrypt/decrypt secure information. This protocol is achieved without the server's knowledge or participation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because a third secure session unknown to the server allows for a more secure communication.

With respect to Claim 27, all the limitation is met by the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's(N.P.S.A.) Guide except the limitation described below.

The limitation "wherein coupling includes establishing a dedicated secure line between the SRP and the web server" is met by Bellwood on page 3, line 40 and page 4, lines 1-2.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because establishing a dedicated line would be useful in providing a secure and private connection to the internet.

With respect to Claims 30 and 31, all the limitation is met by the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's(N.P.S.A.) Guide except the limitation described below.

The limitation "wherein the first/second secure session includes Transport Layer Security protocol" is met by Bellwood on page 1, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because TLS is a well-known and effective protocol in providing privacy and data integrity between communicating entities.

With respect to Claim 32, all the limitation is met by the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's(N.P.S.A.) Guide except the limitation described below.

The limitation "wherein the first secure session includes Secure Socket Layer protocol" is met by Bellwood on page 1, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because SSL is a well-known and effective protocol in providing privacy and data integrity between communicating entities.

With respect to Claim 34 and 35, all the limitation is met by the Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's(N.P.S.A.) Guide except the limitation described below.

The limitation "wherein the first/second secure session includes IPsec" is implicitly met by Bellwood on page 1, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because IPsec is a form of authentication and encryption protocol and is comparable to TLS/SSL with respect to achieving the same functions of preserving the integrity of the data.

Claims 37, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide in view of Maruyama et al (US2002/0015497 A1)

With respect to Claim 37, the limitation “a processing mechanism” is met inherently by N.P.S.A. in Chapter 7, first paragraph.

Further limitation of “an encryption and decryption mechanism” is inherently met by N.P.S.A. in Chapter 7, page 1, fourth paragraph and Fig. 7.4.

Further limitation of “a tamper-resistant mechanism for storing one or more keys, wherein the one or more keys are known only to the SRP and are used for encrypting the content before storing the content in a secure local cache for future requests for the content” is partly met by N.P.S.A. in Chapter 7, Fig. 7.4. N.P.S.A. however does not disclose a tamper resistant mechanism for storing one or more keys.

The tamper resistant mechanism for storing one or more keys is met by Maruyama et al on paragraph 52 on page 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maruyama et al within the system of N.P.S.A. because a tamper resistant mechanism for storing keys provides a greater form of security to the system.

With respect to Claim 51, all the limitation is met by N.P.S.A. except that disclosed below.

Maruyama meets the limitation of “a processing mechanism”, “a tamper-resistant mechanism for storing one or more keys, wherein the one or more keys are known only to the SRP and are used for encrypting the content before storing the content in a secure local cache for future requests for the content” on page 4, paragraph 52; and “an encryption and decryption mechanism” on Fig. 4 and page 4, paragraph 52.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maruyama et al within the system of N.P.S.A. because a tamper resistant mechanism provides a greater form of security to the system.

With respect to Claim 52, all the limitation is met by N.P.S.A. except that disclosed below.

The limitation of “wherein the tamper-resistant mechanism includes a tamper-resistant non-volatile card” is met by Maruyama et al on paragraph 52, on page 4.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Maruyama et al within the system of N.P.S.A. because a tamper resistant mechanism provides a greater form of security to the system.

With respect to Claim 53, the limitation “wherein the local cache includes non-volatile memory” is met by the Netscape Proxy Administrator’s (N.P.S.A.) Guide on Chapter 9, first and fourth paragraph. The cache is described under the “Understanding the Cache Structure” of Chapter 9, first paragraph as consisting of partitions, which is a storage area located on a disk. These disk partitions are non-volatile storage media and hence will retain information when the power is removed.

With respect to Claim 54, the limitation “wherein the SRP appliance is configured for using a secure protocol” is met by N.P.S.A. on Chapter 7, page 2, 2nd paragraph.

With respect to Claim 55, the limitation “wherein the SRP appliance is configured for using a secure socket layer protocol” is met N.P.S.A. on Chapter 7, page 2, 2nd paragraph.

With respect to Claim 58, the limitation “wherein the SRP appliance is coupled among at least one web server and at least one web browser, wherein the SRP appliance intercepts requests from the at least one web browser to establish a secure network communication session with the at least one web server” is met by N.P.S.A. on Chapter 7, figure 7.4.

Claim 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's (N.P.S.A.) Guide in view of Maruyama et al (US2002/0015497 A1) in further view of Bellwood (WO 01/03398 A2)

With respect to Claim 56, all the limitation is met by the combination of N.P.S.A. and Maruyama et al except that of an IPSec protocol being used.

The limitation “wherein the SRP appliance is configured for using IPSec techniques” is met implicitly by Bellwood on page 1, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because IPsec is a form of authentication and encryption protocol and is comparable to TLS/SSL with respect to achieving the same functions of preserving the integrity of the data.

With respect to Claim 57, all the limitation is met by the combination for N.P.S.A. and Maruyama except that of using a TLS protocol.

This is met by Bellwood on page 1, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bellwood within the system of N.P.S.A. because TLS is a well-known and effective protocol in providing privacy and data integrity between communicating entities.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracey Akpati whose telephone number is 703-305-7820. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-6.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OTA


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EX
TECHNOLOGY CENTER :